

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION**

ORANGE ELECTRONIC CO. LTD.,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

AUTEL INTELLIGENT TECHNOLOGY  
CORP., LTD.,

*Defendant.*

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:21-CV-00240-JRG

**FINAL JUDGMENT**

A jury trial commenced in the above-captioned case on June 5, 2023. On June 8, 2023, the jury reached and returned its unanimous verdict finding that (1) Plaintiff Orange Electronic Co. Ltd. (“Plaintiff”) proved by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Autel Intelligent Technology Corp., Ltd. (“Defendant”) infringed claims 26 and 27 of U.S. Patent No. 8,031,064; (2) Defendant did not prove by clear and convincing evidence that claims 26 and 27 of U.S. Patent No. 8,031,064 are invalid as obvious; (3) Defendant did not prove by clear and convincing evidence that the claim elements of U.S. Patent No. 8,031,064, both individually and as an ordered combination, involve only technology that was well-understood, routine, and conventional at the time of the alleged invention; and (4) Plaintiff proved by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant willfully infringed U.S. Patent No. 8,031,064. (Dkt. No. 159 at 4–7.) The jury ultimately found that Plaintiff proved by a preponderance of the evidence that \$6,616,397 would compensate it for its damages for infringement from May 15, 2020 through April 30, 2023. (*Id.* at 8.)

However, subsequent to the trial, the Court granted Defendant’s Rule 50(b) Post-Trial Motion concerning infringement. (Dkt. No. 215.) There, the Court held that there is no legally


sufficient evidentiary basis for a reasonable jury to find that Plaintiff proved by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant infringed claims 26 and 27 of U.S. Patent No. 8,031,064. (*Id.*)

Pursuant to Rule 58 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and in accordance with the entirety of the record, the Court hereby **ORDERS** and **ENTERS JUDGMENT** as follows:

1. Defendant has not infringed claims 26 and 27 of U.S. Patent No. 8,031,064;
2. Claims 26 and 27 of U.S. Patent No. 8,031,064 are not invalid;
3. Claims 26 and 27 of U.S. Patent No. 8,031,064 are not patent ineligible; and
4. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d), Local Rule CV-54, and 28 U.S.C. § 1920, Defendant is the prevailing party in this case and shall recover its costs from Plaintiff. Defendant is directed to file its proposed Bill of Costs.
5. Consequently, IT IS ORDERED AND DECREED that Plaintiff take nothing from Defendant.

All other requests for relief and requested by either party but not specifically addressed herein are **DENIED**.

**So ORDERED and SIGNED this 2nd day of May, 2024.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
RODNEY GILSTRAP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE